

Remarks/Arguments

Applicants have carefully considered the Office Action dated April 22, 2003 and the references cited therein. Applicants respectfully request reexamination and reconsideration of the application.

Claim 3 specifically recites "announcing the data change to the *registered application from which the data was originally obtained*" (claim 3, lines 3-4). In setting forth the rejections, the Examiner admits that Cheng does not teach announcing the data change. Instead the Examiner alleges that Cheng teaches that the service provider computer keeps information, and, alleges that it would have been obvious to consider the activity of the limitation as discussed above as the client computer would let the server computer know that it has done the updating, therefore the server computer knows exactly the date and time of the finished job. Applicants respectfully traversing the Examiner's rejections for the following reasons. The fact that the service provider computer keeps the date and time when the download process was completed by the client computer is of no relevance to the above described limitation. In order to satisfy the above described limitation, according to the Examiner's analogy, the client application 104 would have to have announced to the software vendor computer system 103 that the data was changed, since the requested data was originally obtained from the software vendor computer system (Cheng col. 8, lines 39-43). There is no disclosure or teaching of such functionality within Cheng. Examiner will note that the motivations of the present invention is not to provide the exact date and time that an updating job is finished, but instead to provide a virtual bus structure in which data consumers and data producers can exchange data over the virtual bus through a series of events which are monitored (listened for). Notification to the registered application from which the data originated is part of the virtual bus protocol and serves a legitimate confirmation purpose. The Examiner has not shown where Cheng teaches, discloses or suggest such announcements back to the original application.

Claim 1 has now been amended to include the relevance limitation of claim 3. Specifically, claim 1 now recites "announcing the data change to the *registered*

application from which the data was originally obtained" (claim 1, lines 13-14). In light of the foregoing amendments and arguments, and by the Examiner's own admissions, claim 1 is now believed allowable over Cheng whether considered singularly or in combination with Rangarajan, or any other reference of record. The corresponding limitation of claim 3 has been canceled, without prejudice. Claims 4 through 8 include all the limitations of amended claim 1 and are believed allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1, as well as for the merits of their own respective limitations.

Claim 14 has been similarly amended to include the relevant limitation of claim 16. Specifically, claim 14 now recites a computer program product concluding "*program code for announcing the data change across the information bus to the registered application from which the data was originally obtained"* (claim 14, lines 17-18). In light of the foregoing amendments and arguments, and by the Examiner's own admissions, claim 14 is now believed allowable over Cheng whether considered singularly or in combination with Rangarajan, or any other reference of record, for at least the same reasons as claim 1 up, as well as on the merits of its own respective limitations. The corresponding limitation of claim 16 has been canceled, without prejudice. Claims 17 through 21 include all the limitations of amended claim 14 and are similarly believed allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 14, as well as for the merits of their own respective limitations.

Claims 1-3, 6-16 and 19-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,151,643, hereafter Cheng, in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,260,077, Rangarajan et al. hereafter Rangarajan. As to claim 1, the Examiner alleges that Cheng discloses all of the recited limitations except that the Examiner admits that Cheng does not explicitly teach an *event listener*. Instead, the Examiner relying on Rangarajan, alleging that Rangarajan teaches an event listener (an event listener, column 9, lines 24) for monitoring announcements and notifications (column 9, lines 34-38). The Examiner further states that "It would have been obvious to apply the teachings of Rangarajan to the system of Cheng because this allows a registered client to receive event notifications from a source as disclosed by Rangarajan (lines 8-84, column 9)". The Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections for the following reasons. Even assuming that the combination of the Cheng and Rangarajan


references was proper, and that Rangarajan discloses an event listener, as alleged, both assumptions of which Applicants respectfully disagrees, claims 1 and 14, and their respective deepening claims, are believed allowable over the combination of Cheng and Rangarajan in light of the foregoing amendments thereto.

Claims 4-5, 7 and 17-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheng in view of Rangarajan, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,356,948, Barnett. Barnett does not compensate for the Examiner's admitted deficiencies in the Cheng reference or the disclosure relied upon in the Rangarajan patent. Accordingly, these claims are believed allowable for the reasons set forth above.

Claim 9 and its respective dependent claims are believed allowable over the combination of Cheng and Rangarajan in their current format for at least the reasons stated above with reference to the traversals of the other pending claims in the subject application.

Applicants believe the claims are in allowable condition. A notice of allowance for this application is solicited earnestly. If the Examiner has any further questions regarding this amendment, he is invited to call Applicants' attorney at the number listed below. The Examiner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any balances under 37 CFR §1.17, and 1.16 to Deposit Account No. DA-12-2158.

Respectfully submitted,



Bruce D. Jobse, Esq., Reg. No. 33,518
KUDIRKA & JOBSE, LLP
Customer Number 021127
Tel: (617) 367-4600 Fax: (617) 367-4656

Date: 7/22/03